

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,612	06/13/2001	Kenji Mukai	NAK1-BP14	7017
21611 75	90 02/03/2005		EXAMINER	
SNELL & WILMER LLP			РНАМ, НОА Q	
1920 MAIN STREET SUITE 1200		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
IRVINE, CA	92614-7230		2877	
			DATE MAILED: 02/03/2009	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) LJ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)

Attachment(s)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)

6) Other: \_

Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_

Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/880,612 . Page 2

Art Unit: 2877

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/22/04 has been entered.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over lkeda et al (5,071,727).

Regarding claim 1, Ikeda et al (of record) discloses a method for evaluating whiteness of an object comprising the steps of (a) calculating chroma (C) (column 10, lines 20-21), calculating whiteness from the chroma using an equation (1) w= aC + b ... (it is noted that the equation in column 10, line 7 of Ikeda et al is in the same form of the equation (1) of the present invention). Ikeda et al does not explicitly teach that the chroma is calculated by a method defined by the CIE 1997 Interim Color Appearance

Application/Control Number: 09/880,612 Page 3

Art Unit: 2877

Model, however, it would have been obvious to use replace the calculating method of lkeda et al by this method because they are function in the same manner.

4. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over lkeda et al in view of Nishino et al (4,469,798).

Ikeda et al does not explicitly teach that the coefficient b is 100 and coefficient a is a negative real number such as –5.3, -3.3, or –4.4. Nishino et al (of record) teaches that the whiteness (W) can be calculated from the equation "W=100-(100-L)² + a² +b²", coefficient b is 100 and coefficient a is a variable negative real number (column 8, lines 5-17). Thus, it would have been an obvious at the time the invention was made to modify the equation of Ikeda et al by choosing the different values of the coefficient a and b as taught by Nishino et al for the same purpose of determining the whiteness of light emitted from a light source.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claim 7 is allowed.
- 6. Claims 4-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

## Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 2877

7. Applicant's arguments filed 11/22/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- a. Applicant's remarks, page 5, argues that the references do not teach or suggest a method for evaluating the whiteness of light emitted from a **fluorescent** lamp; however, this limitation is not recited in the body of the claims. The recitation that "a method of evaluating whiteness of light emitted from a fluorescent lamp, comprising the steps of:" has not been given patentable weight because it has been held that a preamble is denied toe effect of a limitation where the claim following the preamble is a self-contained description of the structure not depending for completeness upon the introductory clause. Kropa v. Robie, 88 USPQ 478 (CCPA 1951).
- b. With respect to the argument in pages 6-7 of remarks, as mentioned above
  the Ikeda et al reference read on the claimed invention, especially equation in column
  10, line 7. As understood, equation can be derives as follow:

$$W=1-1/40(C^2+[4(10-V)]^2)^{1/2}$$

$$W = -1/40\{C^2 + [4(10-V)]^2\}^{1/2} + 1$$

When: +[4(10-V)]<sup>2</sup> is a very small number, we have

$$W = -1/40(C^2)^{1/2} + 1$$

Thus, W=-1/40C + 1

Let a=-1/40 and b=1, W=aC+b, therefore the equation is the same as equation claimed in present claims 1 and 84.

Application/Control Number: 09/880,612 Page 5

Art Unit: 2877

c. Applicant's remarks, pages 6-7, argue that Ikeda does not teach or suggest that the V value approaches a numerical value of 10 or that the term  $[4(10-V)]^2$  approaches zero. Applicant is noted that the value V is variable, therefore it could be any value and at the value V=10, the reference read on the present claimed invention. Nowhere in Ikeda recites that the value V cannot be 10 or the term  $[4(10-V)]^2$  cannot approach to zero. In addition, the two equations  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  are the same when V is equal to 10.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Alguard (4,699,510) discloses a color sensor.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoa Q. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-2426. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM to 6 PM, Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory J. Toatley, Jr. can be reached on (571) 272-2800 ext. 77. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hoá Q. Pham **Primary Examiner** 

Art Unit 2877

HP

January 31, 2005